

1 Rachel S. Doughty (Cal. Bar No. 255904)  
2 Jennifer Rae Lovko (Cal. Bar No. 208855)  
3 GREENFIRE LAW, PC  
4 2478 Adeline Street, Suite A  
5 Berkeley, CA 94703  
6 Ph/Fax: (510) 900-9502  
7 Email: [rdoughty@greenfirerlaw.com](mailto:rdoughty@greenfirerlaw.com)  
8 [rlovko@greenfirerlaw.com](mailto:rlovko@greenfirerlaw.com)

9  
10 *Attorneys for Petitioners Save Our Forest Association, Inc.*

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**EASTERN DIVISION**

SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION, INC.

Case No.: 5:24-cv-01336-JGB-DTB

Plaintiffs,

**[PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF  
SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION,  
INC.'s MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE  
RELATED CASES PURSUANT TO FED.  
R. CIV. P. § 42(a)**

vs.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE, an agency of the U.S.  
Department of Agriculture, and MICHAEL  
NOBLES, in his official capacity as Acting  
District Ranger for the San Bernardino National  
Forest,

Action Filed: June 25, 2024  
Assigned to: Hon. Jesus G. Bernal

Defendants.

BLUETRITON BRANDS, INC.

Case No.: 2:24-cv-09720-JGB-DTB

Plaintiffs,

Action Filed: August 6, 2024  
Assigned to: Hon. Jesus G. Bernal

vs.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, an  
agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
and MICHAEL NOBLES, in his official  
capacity as Acting District Ranger for the San  
Bernardino National Forest,

Defendants.

1 The Court has fully considered the Motion to Consolidate Related Cases filed by Plaintiff  
2 SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION, INC. ("SOFA") and any response and reply thereto. This  
3 Court has broad discretion in determining whether consolidation is practical. *Atlantic States Legal*  
4 *Foundation Inc. v. Koch Refining Co.*, 681 F. Supp 609, 615 (D. Minn. 1988). In exercising this  
5 discretion, this Court has weighed both the time and effort consolidation would save with any  
6 inconvenience or delay it would cause. *Hendrix v. Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 1492, 1495  
7 (11th Cir. 1985); *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984). See also *Kramer v.*  
8 *Boeing Co.*, 134 F.R.D. 256 (D. Minn. 1991).

9 Here, consolidation offers efficiency and convenience in these matters. A consolidated  
10 proceeding will save time and avoid unnecessary costs to all parties and this Court.

11 Accordingly, good cause having been shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the two  
12 actions be consolidated into one proceeding.

13  
14 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28